

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Final Office Action mailed February 23, 2006. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-16 and 18-33 were pending in the Application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims and favorable action in this case.

Section 102 Rejection

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-5, 10-16, 18-20, and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,167,520 issued to Touboul (hereinafter "*Touboul*"). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection of the above-mentioned claims. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); M.P.E.P. §2131.

Touboul does not disclose, teach, or suggest, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of the claims. For example, Claim 1 includes "denying one or more threads of an application access to a secured resource if said one or more threads has previously exhibited Internet behavior and has not met a specific condition for accessing said secured resource; and denying said one or more threads of the application Internet behavior if, at a time access is sought to the Internet, said one or more threads is accessing a secured resource." In contrast, *Touboul* only discloses managing suspicious downloadables if the downloadable is known to be suspicious or the downloadable violates a security rule (Fig. 5), which *Touboul* defines as "READ/WRITE operations to a system configuration file, READ/WRITE operations to a document containing trade secrets, overuse of memory, overuse of system processor time, too many applets running concurrently, or too many images being displayed concurrently." Col. 4, ll. 32-37. The Examiner states that *Touboul* discloses "[t]he applet will be terminated and the memory or processor time available to the applet will become limited [] if the Internet behavior of the downloadable exhibits suspicious behavior and violates (do[es] not meet) the security policy rules, the downloadable is terminated (denying access) (See Column 5, lines 63-67, Column 6, lines 1-13)." *Office*

Action, p. 4. The Examiner recognizes that, in *Touboul*, a downloadable exhibiting suspicious Internet behavior and violating security policy rules effects a termination of the applet. Therefore, *Touboul* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the limitations of Applicants' Claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that *Touboul* cannot anticipate Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claim 1 and its dependents.

Independent Claims 13-16 each recite certain limitations that, for reasons substantially similar to those discussed with reference to independent Claim 1, are not disclosed, taught, or suggested, either expressly or inherently, by *Touboul*. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 13-16.

Section 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 6-9 and 21-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over *Touboul* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,623,600 issued to Ji et al. (hereinafter "*Ji*"). Claims 6-9 and 21-30 each depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 1, which has been shown above to be allowable. Accordingly, dependent Claims 6-9 and 21-30 are allowable over the prior art at least because of their dependencies. Additionally, dependent Claims 6-9 and 21-30 recite limitations that neither *Touboul* nor *Ji*, alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest, either expressly or inherently. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 6-9 and 21-30.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for all other reasons clear and apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Applicants believe that no fee is due. However, if this is not the case, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to advance prosecution of this application, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact its attorney, Barton E. Showalter, at (214) 953-6509.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants


Barton E. Showalter
Reg. No. 38,302

Date: April 24, 2006

Correspondence Address:

at Customer No. **05073**